WHAT TIMES! WHAT MORALS! WHERE ON EARTH ARE WE?

BY REV. H. C. SEMPLE, S.J.

BJ49
S5

DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

HOLY CHRIST
FERNDALE
NORWALK, CONN.

WHAT TIMES! WHAT MORALS! WHERE ON EARTH ARE WE?

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS.
Theology of Rome and Canterbury in a Nutshell. 16mo, *net*, $0.35

What Times! What Morals! Where on Earth Are We?

BY

Rev. Henry Churchill Semple, S.J.
Moderator of the Theological Conferences of the Archdiocese of New York, author of "Anglican Ordinations," etc.

NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO
BENZIGER BROTHERS
PRINTERS TO THE HOLY APOSTOLIC SEE | PUBLISHERS OF BENZIGER'S MAGAZINE
1910

BJ49
S5

Permissu Superiorum.

Nihil Obstat.

REMY LAFORT,
Censor Librorum.

Imprimatur.

✠ JOHN M. FARLEY,
Archbishop of New York.

NEW YORK, Feb. 21, 1910.

COPYRIGHT, 1910, BY BENZIGER BROTHERS.

PREFACE

FROM "THE COSMOPOLITAN MAGAZINE"[1]

BLASTING AT THE ROCK OF AGES

BY HAROLD BOLCE

THE very hopes of man, the thoughts of his heart, the religion of nations, the manners and morals of mankind are all at the mercy of a new generalization.—EMERSON.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the first of a series of three articles by Mr. Bolce, who has now completed a study of American colleges extending over two years. What Mr. Bolce sets down here is of the most astounding character. Out of the curricula

[1]May, 1909.

JUN 3 1987

of American colleges a dynamic movement is upheaving ancient foundations and promising a way for revolutionary thought and life. Those who are not in touch with the great colleges of the country will be astonished to learn the creeds being fostered by the faculties of our great universities. In hundreds of classrooms it is being taught daily that the Decalogue is no more sacred than a syllabus; that the home as an institution is doomed; that there are no absolute evils; that immorality is simply an act in contravention of society's accepted standards; that democracy is a failure and the Declaration of Independence only spectacular rhetoric; that the change from one religion to another is like getting a new hat; that moral precepts are passing shibboleths; that

conceptions of right and wrong are as unstable as styles of dress; that wide stairways are open between social levels, but that to the climber children are encumbrances; that the sole effect of prolificacy is to fill tiny graves; and that there can be and are holier alliances without the marriage bond than within it. These are some of the revolutionary and sensational teachings submitted with academic warrant to the minds of hundreds of thousands of students in the United States. It is time that the public realized what is being taught to the youth of this country. "The social question of to-day," said Disraeli, "is only a zephyr which rustles the leaves, but will soon become a hurricane." It is a dull ear that can not hear the mutterings of the coming storm.

What Times! What Morals! Where on Earth Are We?

THE five articles published by Mr. Harold Bolce in the "Cosmopolitan" from May to September, 1909, under the title "Blasting at the Rock of Ages," have left many minds still startled. After perusing them, some of us threw them into the waste-basket, while a few perhaps laid them up on the top shelf for possible future reference. But some of us who are thoughtful were so bewildered that we rubbed our eyes and exclaimed, "What times! What morals! Where on earth are we?" and we felt much like the Father of his Country when he was faced even in the Senate by audacious Catiline, the known plotter of the ruin of Rome and the slaughter

of the senators. Some of us wondered if it were possible in this twentieth century that one American, a native of the soil, lecturing to Americans in America, had taught from an American university chair to young men and women confided to him by American parents that there is no right or wrong. For the knowledge of right and wrong has been our one test whether the child has attained the years of discretion, the use of reason; and in our courts it has been the one accepted test as to whether the accused is sane or insane, *compos mentis* or *non compos mentis,* responsible or not responsible for a criminal act. Can any one, we asked, have broached such wild, pernicious theories in schools which we foster? **Are we not the most practical of all races?** Have we not the most com-

mon-sense? And is it not the secret of our country's progress and glory that she is the home, not of license, but of true liberty, which secures just rights? Is it possible that some one amongst us is teaching that the Fathers of our government were mistaken when they signed the Declaration of Independence and taught that all men have **some** inalienable rights and that governments **can** be tyrannical? Is there one here proclaiming that Might makes Right, that right is only the mandate of statute or whim backed by force or by a majority of votes and the fashion of the hour?

Most of us know that the existence of **our courts of equity** implies that there are some things good or bad in themselves, that the chancellor was originally the keeper of the king's conscience, and that he is now among

us the keeper of the conscience of the sovereign people, and that conscience dictates to do some things as right and to avoid some things as wrong—often apart from any statute—often even apart from any overt act.

Our usage of the oath before judges and notaries on many solemn occasions shows that our separation between Church and State is universally regarded as not irreligious like the French or Latin-American separations.[1]

It also shows that we Americans

[1]President Taft's remarks on the fiftieth anniversary of St. Aloysius Church, Washington, D. C., November 14, 1909: "I am glad to be present on this occasion, the golden jubilee of the foundation of this church. In our country, in this government, and under our Constitution there is no union of Church and State, but rather a declared separation of them. This has sometimes been misunderstood by those who did not know our institutions as an indication that there was something hostile on the part of our government or some lack of sympathy with the Church of

recognize one, all-seeing, almighty Judge, who has made the law of veracity and fidelity and justice, and who here or hereafter punishes the breakers of this law and helps its keepers.

If a statute by taking its course would be seen to work a manifest wrong, **our grand juries** would refuse to indict, our prosecutors to prosecute, our juries to convict, our judges to apply such statute, at least in equity courts, whose maxims are largely the principles of Catholic

God. This is as far as possible from the truth, and I have always sought in assisting each church on interesting occasions like this to testify by my presence and by words of congratulation that there is nothing which the people and the country of the United States so depend upon for progress and advancement of their ideals as the influence and power of all the churches in the community. . . . I am here to-day, therefore, to testify as a representative of the Government to the sympathy we have with this instrument and all others that make for righteousness."

morals taught by the first chancellors, who were Catholic ecclesiastics. These things and many others in our legal life suppose that there are some obligations of conscience and some morality apart from legality.

Our Federal Constitution is now the oldest of all written constitutions, and is the admiration of wise foreign thinkers. How deeply and justly we esteem and love and venerate it! And yet all of us North and South in our calm and thoughtful moods have ever held that not only above the Constitution, but also through and under it, there is a **higher law,** the law of moral right and wrong, and that in the improbable supposition of the applications of the Constitution conflicting with the higher law, the Constitution itself would have to give way.

We Catholics have been taught from earliest childhood that every permission, counsel, or command of state, family, pope, council, or even of the Divine Son of God, must conform to it, and that every authority must proclaim, **"I have come not to destroy but to fulfil this law."** Our Lord was true God and had all authority in heaven and on earth, and could do away with the laws of Abraham and Moses in judicial and ceremonial matters, but not in morals.

The reason is that this natural law of morals, which is so profoundly enforced by St. Paul to the Romans, is **the eternal law of God** promulgated for man in time. God was free to create or not to create. He was free to create on this earth, such as it is, this religious, social, rational animal, with his essential relatedness

to God, to himself, and to his fellow religious, social, rational animals, or to create another kind of being on another kind of planet. But once He decreed to create this kind of beings to live here He was bound to promulgate and to write on each man's heart His eternal law as man's rule of action here. As soon as there is a mirror of an active will and mind here below, forthwith it must reflect the image of the supreme Sun of Wisdom and Justice above it—"the Divine Reason or Eternal Will of God commanding to keep the order natural for man and forbidding to violate it." You may call this law either essentially the Divine Reason or essentially the Divine Will. But you may not call it God's free will. It is His necessary will, His will necessarily following the order which

He necessarily sees, what He necessarily sees Himself to be, what He necessarily sees man must be to be a good man. Man is the image of God by his reasonable nature, and man's free acts must make him the likeness of God by following his reasonable nature. And these acts as reasonable must conform to man's essential relations toward God, himself, and his neighbor in the concrete conditions around him.

This natural law is more immutable than the course prescribed for the earth around the sun. God leads each species of lifeless matter to its proper end by inherent forces infused in creation. They are inherent and are not outward, like the archer's outward impulse to the arrow. They are not only inherent, but also respectively adapted to special beings.

Moreover, He leads plants and trees to their specific ends by specific vegetative forces. He leads brutes, birds, and fishes by specific instincts. These forces are all inherent, but they are necessary and blind in themselves; they are not free or reasonable. God leads man to his end by powers which are not only inherent, but also intelligent and free. Man's inherent power is his free will. The natural guide of the will, which is blind in itself, is intelligence, reason. God commands man in the free acts of his will to follow reason, He imposes this as duty, as obligation, and this moral duty or obligation is God's necessary means of leading man to his end. If He did not impose this duty on the will to wish what is reasonable, He would show Himself indifferent to right or wrong, He would not have

used the necessary means conformable to man's nature to lead man to his end, He would show Himself not to be holy or wise. He might, therefore, have prescribed another course to our planet around the sun, but He must prescribe and promulgate the moral law to every man.

Order is the first law of heaven, and also of the earth, and the order proper to every reasonable being is the order of love, order in our free desires. Take away the determination of the seventh day for worship, and every other item in the Ten Commandments could be known, without revelation, by pure reason. Every item is reasonable and its opposite unreasonable, and is a dictate, not of reason, but of disorderly whim, pride, sensuality—it is moral degradation —it makes a bad man.

Indeed, few of us in America were prepared to hear of a new civilization, **which teaches that there is nothing wrong in itself,** and that therefore idolatry, irreligion, blasphemy, perjury, dishonor for parents, adultery, thieving, lying, pride, avarice, lust, wrath, gluttony, envy, sloth, imprudence, injustice, cowardice, intemperance, may soon here be made right and virtuous.

Our statutes bar all foreign anarchists from landing on our shores or from becoming American citizens. But if anarchists stopped at anarchy, they would destroy the State only, whereas the **apostles of foreign immoralism** would destroy also the Church, the Family, and the individual Conscience!

The necessity of morality for civilization and the practical necessity

of revealed religion to teach morality are well-known maxims of George Washington and of nearly all the Fathers of our government. **And even Thomas Jefferson,** under date of January 29, 1815, wrote from Monticello to Charles Clay about the famous Jefferson's Bible:

"Probably you have heard me say I had taken the four Evangelists, had cut out from them every text they had recorded of the moral precepts of Jesus, and arranged them in a certain order, and although they appeared but as fragments, yet fragments of **the most sublime edifice of morality which had ever been exhibited to man."**[1]

What a fall it would be for our country from the moral principles of

[1]Morals of Jesus, Washington, 1904, Introduction, p. 15.

Washington and Jefferson to the unprincipled doctrine that there are no principles!

Therefore, for the honor of our country, many hoped soon to hear that Mr. Bolce and the "Cosmopolitan" had been in error, that none of our professors had actually used the words ascribed to them, or at least that none had used them in the sense alleged, or, in fine, that the heads of the institutions with which these professors are connected had repudiated such tenets. **As for ourselves, we had no such hope.**

But before explaining our grounds of despair, it is well to remind the reader that here there is no question of the private or public life and character of professors, but only of their public teachings; that we are now considering only those teachings

which concern morality, and assert, or tend to, immoralism; and lastly, we are not to be understood as assuming that each one of the individual professors accused by Mr. Bolce said the things attributed to him, and in the sense attributed by Mr. Bolce.

We had an elementary knowledge of the history of our own times and of some of its **widespread ethical vagaries.** We had read the debate in the Vatican Council on the doctrine that the one true God and Creator, our First Beginning and Last End, can be known by the natural light of reason, and we had there seen the warning of Bishop Gasser, of Brixen, that from the time of the French Encyclopedists and of the German critical philosophers there had been a deep plan to teach children in the schools a **morality with-**

out God. Many textbooks used in the public schools of France are now openly practising this scheme. It is said that for the last thirty years not one President of France has mentioned the name of God in public. The authorities have ordered the name of God expurgated from the coin and from passages of Voltaire read in the schools!

We remembered the **warning of Pius X** in his first encyclical, that the crime of our age is apostasy from God, and that our war-cry must be "back to Christ."

We had read in **"Pragmatism"** (a book which every Christian clergyman should read, for its manners are those of Voltaire and its principles worse, as Voltaire attacked all revelation, but not all reason and all morality), on page 17, the exag-

gerated but founded testimony of Professor William James of Harvard, that outside of priests educated in Catholic seminaries, English-speaking clergymen are largely pantheistic and agnostic (Dr. Eliot of Harvard is certainly one such preacher), and we knew that every form of pantheism (**a real Yellow Peril**) is only atheism with a mask, and that the immediate logical conclusion from pantheism is that there can be no sin, and that this conclusion is openly deduced by **Dr. Eliot and Mrs. Eddy.**

We had read the testimony of **F. M. Taylor of the University of Michigan** on the "Law of Nature," pp. 1, 2, "what with mild defenders and vigorous enemies, the venerable doctrine is almost out of court. And really when one reminds himself that

for nearly twenty-two centuries this doctrine had practically universal acceptance, that it was the creed of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Marcus Aurelius, Gaius, Augustine, Aquinas, Grotius, Hooker, Locke, Kant, and St. Paul, its present forlorn state is noteworthy. The simple fact is a most astonishing acquiescence in the denunciation of the doctrine here considered. . . . Is this acquiescence warranted? Is **natural law** a myth, an exploded fallacy? The conviction of the writer is that consent to this proposition has been somewhat too hasty; that in fact, even if we choose to discard the name, still all that is essential in the doctrine remains and must remain."

So that, according to the testimony of Professor Taylor, the venerable doctrine that there are certain moral

precepts made by God which man can know by natural reason is out of court, *i.e.,* excluded from class-rooms.

We had also read in **a textbook of jurisprudence:** "The theory thus **exploded** by means of the historical method began with the **assumption** that over and above the laws of men there is a law of nature, an abstract standard of human conduct to which all earthly laws should conform, and to which all mankind should be made to assent through the dictates of universal reason."

"Comte, as founder of the science of society, . . . Comte made possible the social science, etc."

So that, according to this textbook, the existence of a standard of human conduct to which all earthly laws should conform is an **assumption** and has been exploded, and explicit

out-and-out unprincipledness is widespread. The reader who desires to know more about Comte, as the founder of the science of society, is referred to the Century Dictionary under "positive philosophy."

The puerile fallacy underlying positivism is: **Some** moral precepts thought by **some** to be universal and constant have been changed by statute. Therefore all moral precepts are changeable by statute. The easy answer is that, granting that there has been such change, not only as to the **application** of **some** moral precepts, but as to some precepts themselves, the leap from **some** to **all** is not logic.

We had also read in the Catholic Encyclopedia under "Ethics" the testimony of Cathrein that the great majority of non-Christian **philoso-**

phers in our day have followed Herbert Spencer, and we know that Spencer assumes that man has been evolved from the brute, from which he differs only in degree, and that at the basis of all our knowledge, whether philosophical or religious, there are assumptions which are unknowable, and which make all our knowledge of everything uncertain. So that, according to Spencer, our morality is only brute morality, and even that can not be known with certainty, and, according to Cathrein (of whom Socialists have said that he is their only opponent who has read all their literature), Spencer is followed in this by the great majority of non-Christian philosophers in our day.

We had read criticisms such as the following from the **London Spectator in November, 1909:** "We do

not wish to make appeal solely to the principles of Christian morality or to sanctions of religion, though to our mind that appeal is the strongest and greatest of all. What we want to do on the present occasion is to ask even those whose ears are deaf to such an appeal whether they think that it is possible to build up a self-sustained and a permanent State upon the basis which underlies not only Mr. Wells' latest novel, but so considerable a section of the thinking and writing which are described as modern."

We had been assured by well-posted, sober critics that since the days of Coleridge, when German philosophy was introduced in England, **the Rhine and Seine have been flowing into the Thames,** and free-thinking irreligion and license, pre-

viously abhorred by the so-called Anglo-Saxons, have come to be thought fashionable.

We had read in "Philosophy of Theism," by Borden P. Bowne, professor of philosophy in Boston University (Preface, p. vi): **Except in philosophy and theology** there is coming to be a decided conviction that no one has a right to an opinion who has not studied the subject. Offhand decisions of unstudied questions receive very little consideration nowadays in the sciences. It is to be hoped that this mental seriousness may **yet extend to philosophy and theology. At present it is not so.** He would be a rare man indeed who could not settle questions in theology or Biblical criticism without previous study, while the small men who could dispose of philosophy and

philosophers in one afternoon are legion."

Such authors, after asserting that no one can know anything, especially about religion, God, or the worship of God, are sure that they know the precise sense of each verse of the first chapter of Genesis, and in this (as Mr. Mark Twain observed in the "Cosmopolitan" about nine years ago) they **follow the method of Mrs. Eddy,** who gives offhand to the world the key to all the Scriptures, and they do not follow the method of the Popes, who, before deciding the meaning of one of these same verses in 1854, had previously waited to hear the grave debates of a thousand years, and finally waited for the views of a thousand bishops and for the sense of the people of their thousand dioceses.

Anyhow, these authors deny the inspiration of the Bible and all revelation. They place the Vedas or other such books above the Bible. They hold that man has perpetually progressed and risen, that Adam did not fall by original sin, that there was no need of a Redeemer, that there was no creation, that our home is our heaven, not heaven our home, and we must place our hopes of happiness in this life alone.[1]

These wealthy philanthropists write books against Socialism and its statistics and theory of values, and in the same books, by the above enumerated assertions, **lay the deeper foundations of the Socialism of Marx and Engels,** who taught that the morality of the past is a humbug,

[1]Cf. "Problems of To-day," by Andrew Carnegie, pp. 139, 173, 174.

which was invented to keep the poor down, and was based on God and the future life, and not solely on the materialistic interpretation of history.

These authors have seen little or nothing of the faith, hope, and charity, brought out especially in poverty and sickness, in thousands of Christian homes around them. They have not heard the man of high culture and noble birth in a paroxysm of pain before the dangerous operation, exclaim while clasping his crucifix: "How good in Him to die that way, to gain heaven for me, and give me an example! What are my sufferings to my sins against His sanctity and goodness? He had patience there, why not I here? He will take care of my wife and children and mother, Who consoled Mary on Calvary."

They have not seen the venerable woman reduced to poverty without fault of her own, paralyzed, almost covered with bed-sores, and yet ever laughing or praying, and answering that God knows best when to take her, that when He does take her she will be in sweet hands, and that she hopes to be higher in heaven, if she has known Him and loved Him and served Him better and longer on earth, and asking, "How can I say that I am suffering enough when I see Him on the cross, and then sitting at the right hand of God?"

These writers do much for true humanity, but they do not reflect that by unsettling Christian faith they take away that hope which is the source of the greatest happiness even here on earth, and that they thus unconsciously incur the rebuke of Rob-

ert Burns: "Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn." From the days of the Psalmist and of Robert Burns to our own, the anguish of poverty has broken out into the rebellious questionings:

"If I'm designed yon lordling's slave—
By nature's law designed—
Why was an independent wish
E'er planted in my mind?
If not, why am I subject to
His cruelty and scorn?
Or why has man the will and power
To make his fellows mourn?"

We who have been trained in the time-honored philosophy and the Christian faith of the so-called sectarian schools can reply with Burns:

"Yet let not this too much, my son,
Disturb thy youthful breast;
This partial view of human kind
Is surely not the last!

The poor, oppressèd, honest man
Had never sure been born,
Had there not been some recompense
To comfort those that mourn."

Those who have been trained in schools called non-sectarian, where, however, nearly **every professor treats some point of the foundations of religion and morality and perhaps scoffs at them all,** can not give this answer without which all others are absurd.

Such authors perhaps have never reflected that their writings tend to **drive the masses out of Christian churches and to drive them into the Socialist clubs,** and that they are imitating those French aristocrats of the eighteenth century who abused their power of noble birth to take away faith and spread philosophism. And they will not learn wisdom from

the example of the subsequent fate of these same aristocrats under the Reign of Terror which their wicked tyranny had helped to cause.

They laud duty and the standard of duty, and in the next breath deny or doubt God, soul, heaven, and hell, and all dogmas (as if "it is true that suicide, race-suicide, divorce, etc., are wrong" were not dogmas), and they thus **make duty unthinkable to thinkers.** For the sun-dial marks the right time of day and a right conscience knows moral right; but only the sun **makes** the right time of day, and only God, the Creator and Lord, finally **makes moral right** or duty in His creature.

Again they know nothing of

> "Man,
> Whose heaven-erected face
> The smiles of love adorn,"

but they make man a descendant from, and of the same species with, the ape, or rather the pig, born to live and die with his gaze on the ground, and thus incapable of true duty.

When will a new Edmund Burke arise to open their eyes to the folly of their present policy and to the danger of the Great Revolution of the Universe, which they invite? These authors are so different from Sir Walter Scott, who at death felt consoled that he had never written a line against the Christian faith of his numberless readers. This was indeed "man's humanity to man," and has not lessened the fame of the Wizard of the North.

Therefore, from the writings or testimonies of such authors and likewise from many explanations of all morality which explain all morality

away, or at least explain away some one of the Ten Commandments, we were convinced that very many non-Christian American professors **must be blasting at this rock of ages.**

However, the decisive confirmation of our sad expectations has been found in the **utterances of the universities themselves since the publication of the Bolce articles.** We have here placed some of them in order, with commentaries for the benefit of readers who perhaps have already seen them, but have not had leisure to reflect on their significance.

Mr. Goodspeed, Secretary of the University of Chicago, says: "The charges of Bishop McFaul are based on misleading statements attributed to our faculties and members. It is certain that in not one case did these

represent in any way the views of our professors, but rather their observations."

If the statements represent the observations of the professors, we leave the distinction without a difference between **views** and **observations** to the reader's judgment.

President Schurman of Cornell is reported by the newspapers to have said to the National Association of State Universities at Boston, October 8, 1909: "The professor must be left free from the interference of Church or State to follow the dictates of reason, even though his conclusions are at variance with the beliefs which the mass of mankind regards as fundamental truth."

This pronouncement in October after the "Cosmopolitan" article in September, in which many clergymen

denounce the philosophy of some professors as immoralism and as contrary to what the mass of mankind has regarded as fundamental—this pronouncement, taken in its obvious sense in the concrete circumstances, signifies, **"The charges are true, but what are you going to do about it?"** In parenthesis we remark that Roman law, which is the chief basis of the laws of all civilized countries and which is justly called "written reason," and not only Roman law, but also St. Paul and all sane philosophers before our age, had regarded the constant and universal belief of the mass of mankind in a maxim as fundamental moral truth, as infallible —here they had regarded **the voice of the people as the voice of God.**

Ex-President Eliot of Harvard in his lecture before the Summer School

on the New Religion teaches sweeping agnosticism and rank pantheism, and adds: "You have heard in this summer school of the effect of modern philosophy, **ethical theories,** social hopes, and democratic principles on the established churches, and the abandonment of churches altogether by a large proportion of the population in countries mainly Protestant."

He here therefore affirms that one cause of abandonment of churches has been the theories of ethics taught in the colleges. Moreover, in his lecture he scoffs at any future life compensating or consoling for the sufferings of this life, and teaches that the idea of this compensation has retarded the cause of just liberty. We believe that every signer of the Declaration of Independence had faith in the

future life as compensating and consoling for the sufferings of this life, and yet in their case it did not retard the cause of just liberty and it did not make them fools or weaklings.

DR. J. P. LICHTENBERGER

Dr. J. P. Lichtenberger, associate professor in the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, says, according to the "New York Sun," December 4, 1909: "Popular sentiment recognizes worse evils than divorce. . . . Marriage, in the aspect we are discussing, is the legal sanction of the social custom of the family. It is dependent upon law neither for its institution nor for its perpetuation. The time-honored landmarks of religious authority have been obliterated and the new basis has not been fully established. The case is not different in the sphere of ethics. With the changed point of view have come new ethical valuations. The stern morality of Puritanism on theo-

retical standards is being replaced by a practical morality arising out of our changed social conditions. As a combined result, **virtue no longer consists in literal obedience to arbitrary standards** set by community or church, but rather in conduct consistent with the demands of **a growing personality."**

The action of the University of Pennsylvania, in the now celebrated case of Smith v. Lichtenberger, is virtual assumption of **official responsibility for this utterance.**

Professor Lichtenberger had made certain remarks in favor of freer divorce. Mr. Walter George Smith, who had been for many years a trustee of the university, had demanded that in consequence of these remarks as unworthy of the university, Dr. Lichtenberger be dis-

missed. The university, after some delay, had refused to accede to Mr. Smith's demand. Mr. Smith had then offered his own resignation as a trustee. This resignation had been finally accepted, and this utterance of Professor Lichtenberger was given to the Associated Press simultaneously with the announcement of the university's action and with Mr. Smith's statement. It is therefore undeniable that officially and deliberately and pointedly the university assumes special responsibility for the unprincipled principles of Professor Lichtenberger.

So that as to the moral aspect of marriage in particular the University of Pennsylvania is responsible for this proposition: The time-honored landmarks of religious authority have been obliterated and the new basis

has not yet been fully established. For several years we read the "Congressional Record" closely, and we often saw in debates on marriage the older Senators thundering that this is a Christian country, and that we will always maintain marriage as a Christian institution. What a change now, when the University of Pennsylvania is responsible for the tenet that all the time-honored landmarks of religious teaching, Christian teaching on marriage, have been obliterated, and that with Christianity obliterated as the time-honored basis, we now have practically no basis at all, and **logically ought to legalize Mormonism.**

After reading these words, we were greatly consoled for the deaths of our old friends, Senators Pettus and Morgan. What a shock has been spared their hearts!

But Professor Lichtenberger did not stop at the logical wreck of the sacredness of marriage. He seized this opportunity **to defy all morality on all matters,** and to defy all Christians and all Hebrews and all our ancestors, who venerated unchangeable moral principles as sacred.

"The case is not different in the sphere of ethics" (the science of morals). "With the changed point of view have come new ethical valuations." ("Changed **point of view"** means new principles, new premises from which to form new conclusions, if it means anything distinct.) "The stern morality of Puritanism on theoretical standards is being replaced by a practical morality arising out of our changed social conditions. As a combined result, virtue no longer consists in literal obedience to arbitrary stand-

ards set by community or church, but rather is conduct consistent with the demands of a growing personality."

"The demands of a growing personality" here in the concrete and in practice mean the **demands of a growing Professor Lichtenberger.**

Really we have never read in one sane philosopher or in one Christian writer that we can be obliged in conscience to obey the **arbitrary** statute of any being, human or divine. We have read in many of our standard philosophers and Christian theologians the explicit contradictory.

What does **St. Thomas Aquinas** hold on this subject? Let him speak for himself. "From the preceding four chapters can be gathered the **definition of law,** which is nothing else than 'an ordinance of **reason** for the common good, and by one

who has care of the community, promulgated' " (1, 2, q. 90, art. 4).

"Human law has in it the character or concept of law only in so far as it is conformable to **right reason"** (1, 2, q. 93, art. 3).

"Law must have for its regulator some character of **reason;** and in this way is the saying to be understood that the will of the ruler has the force of law; otherwise the will of the ruler would be **tyranny** rather than law" (1, 2, q. 90, art. 1).

Hence, according to St. Thomas, the first essential element of a true law is reasonableness. **If it is arbitrary, it can not begin to be a law.**

Certainly changes of conditions may involve **some** changes of moral relations and **some** changes of duties or rights, and the enacting of **some** new statutes. But when we had

changed our government from that of the colonies of George III to that of the Republic of the United States of America, we never dreamed of any radical social revolution, as did the Reign of Terror, which Professor Lichtenberger's logic would import into the United States. Much less did a single one of the Fathers of our government ever dream that any new conditions would logically necessitate a new idea of virtue itself. **Until we have a new God, a new human race, a new earth, and a new heaven and hell, we can not have a new idea of virtue.**

The University of Pennsylvania in this case does not show itself the heir of the **sense of humor of Benjamin Franklin,** who founded the American Philosophical Society and the University of Pennsylvania in the

year 1743, if the "Century Dictionary of Names" is accurate. We commend to the university's meditation one of Franklin's wise and witty commentaries on Aristotle, which we remember reading many years ago somewhere in Franklin's "Memoirs." "Man is a rational animal. Yes, Aristotle was right. For how often man shows himself to be an **animal,** who finds a **reason** to justify anything he **likes** to do." If Franklin had been an Isaias, could he have drawn a truer picture of the new gospel of marriage and of all virtue authorized by his (?) University of Pennsylvania in the year of Our Lord 1909?

When Professor Lichtenberger announces that in the past virtue consisted in literal obedience to arbitrary standards set by community or

church, he comes very close to saying with Max Nordau that **our moral precepts are "conventional lies."** If he holds that they are arbitrary, he means that they are as **changeable as fashions of dress.** His phrase "growing personality" as the supreme standard is also painfully similar to Nietzsche's superman or superwoman, who, according to Nietzsche, is above the old morality, which was invented for "the common herd," "the too many," and does not apply to geniuses, such as each reader of Nietzsche's novels may imagine himself or herself to be, and thus to be **free from the old morality.**

After all, the word **arbitrary** is not applicable to the Catholic Church in the matter of marriage **and Americans have had this fact brought home to them.** In the year 1805

Napoleon the Great had been crowned Emperor by Pope Pius VII in Notre Dame at Paris, and was at the height of his glory and the arbiter of Europe, and had reminded Cardinal Gonsalvi, the Papal Secretary of State, that his power to harm the Catholic Church was greater than that of Henry VIII of England.

The Pope had returned from Paris to Rome on May 16, 1805, and Napoleon had written three memorials to the Pope asking for a declaration of nullity of the marriage of Jerome Bonaparte to Elizabeth Patterson, a young American Protestant woman of Baltimore, which marriage had been celebrated at Baltimore before Bishop John Carroll on December 24, 1803. We were then the youngest of the great powers and far from the mightiest. Elizabeth

Patterson was not the daughter of a king and aunt of an emperor, as was Catharine of Aragon, and she was not even a Catholic. Yet in his refusal, dated June 26, 1805, Pope Pius wrote to Napoleon: "If we usurped an authority which we have not, we would render ourselves guilty of a most abominable **abuse of our sacred ministry** before the tribunal of God and before the entire Church. Your majesty itself, in its justice, would not like for us to pronounce a judgment contrary to the testimony of our conscience and to the invariable principles of the Church."[1]

Although previously Napoleon had often declared himself a new Charlemagne providentially raised up to protect the Church, after this letter he grew cold and then hostile to the

[1]Rohrbacher, v. xiv, p. 446.

Pope, whom he finally dethroned and exiled and imprisoned at Savona near Genoa. We fail to see an arbitrary standard of marriage or of virtue here set by the Church.

However, if one had to choose between arbitrary standards set by **Napoleon or Professor Lichtenberger** and their growing personalities on the one hand, or set by **the Catholic Church,** *semper eadem,* on the other, the virtuous American wife and mother, using her common-sense, would prefer the standard set by the Church which thus defended Elizabeth Patterson as a legitimate Bonaparte.

We congratulate our friend, Mr. Walter George Smith, on showing himself the worthy son of Major-General Thomas Kilby Smith, U. S. A., and refusing the use of his

name as a sanction of freer divorce and new virtue.

Finally, we thank the University of Pennsylvania for coming out into the open and frankly telling the guardians of youth some of the principles of morality (?) which it authorizes. Mr. Bolce's charges against this university are sustained.

DR. NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER

UNDER the title "The American College under Fire," Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, wrote an article in the "Educational Review," in December, 1909, which had been previously printed in the "New York Evening Post" of September 25, 1909. We read on pages 515-516 of the "Review": "The other criticism is set in motion by the lapping waves of that popular tide whose yellow is, as the dictionaries have it, a token or symbol of jealousy, envy, melancholy. Probably through inadvertence, the dictionaries omit to add the word 'ignorance.' This crude criticism of the baser sort may be first disposed

of. Because ignorant, it is impertinent. Nevertheless, it reaches the public and measurably affects public opinion. One of the most important commercial discoveries of recent years is that in our American democracy, **attack upon the existing order and upon established institutions has a cash value.** If it rises to unusual heights of shrill abuse, it is for the moment talked about, and is so far important. One thrifty but hitherto unknown person recently sold three articles" (articles in May, June, July, August, and September are not three, but five) "to a confiding editor, **the purport of which was that conspicuous teachers in American colleges did not teach their pupils things known not to be true,** but did inculcate openness of mind and the habit of scientific inquiry. The

business of the world went on without interruption.

"Soon after, a presumably good bishop, turning for a moment from the faith once delivered to the saints, announced in stentorian tones that were heard by the newspapers from Maine to California, that he would as lief send a boy to hell as to one of the large American colleges." (Bishop McFaul disclaims this report of his words.) "Within ten days the number of aspiring candidates for the alternative resting-place had increased, we are told, by many hundred. . . . And so it goes, through a tiresome round of ignorance, misunderstanding, half-truth, malevolence, and sheer sensationalism."

Our first remark is that Dr. Butler uses **the tactics of abuse** of the persons advocating the other side.

The criticism by his adversaries is crude, of the baser sort, set in motion by lapping waves of the popular tide; it is yellow, jealousy, envy, melancholy, ignorant, impertinent, made for cash, half-truth, malevolence, sheer sensationalism, turning from the faith once delivered to the saints, announced in stentorian tones. But big words break no bones. If we were unprejudiced and experienced spectators of controversies, would we not at the outset suspect that he is following the maxim: "When my case is hopeless, the only thing is to abuse the lawyer on the other side and thus throw dust in the eyes of the jury"? The fact is that Dr. Butler's only argument here is abuse of Mr. Bolce and Bishop McFaul.

From this mountain of abuse what

is the **ridiculous mouse coming forth?**

The question is whether conspicuous professors taught the things attributed to them by Mr. Bolce. Does Dr. Butler make an answer entering into the merits of the case? Does he deny the facts alleged? There is not one word here which can be interpreted as a denial of the fact that the professors said such things. His only reply is not a direct answer, but a demurrer, as the chancery lawyer would tell him.

He says that "the purport of the Bolce articles is that the professors did not teach things **known not to be true.**" We acknowledge that this is a clumsy construction, and its clumsiness is surprising in a master of words like Dr. Butler, especially in the principal sentence of his paper.

We acknowledge also that we have not seen any of Dr. Butler's adversaries bringing out the meaning of the phrase, which after all is not hard to sift. He says **"things known not to be true."** Known to Mr. Bolce? This is out of the question here. Known commonly? Or known to the professors? Or known to Dr. Butler? This is not clear, but it is likewise all beside the question and immaterial. However, they are, according to Dr. Butler, **known to somebody not to be true; known, not thought, not to be true! This means they are certainly false!**

Now what are the things which, according to Dr. Butler, are **known not to be true?** What are the things which Mr. Bolce asserts these professors did not teach? The reader may see them with his own eyes in

the preface of this paper. Let him look at the words of the Editor's head-note to Mr. Bolce's articles. They are transcribed in our preface. There Mr. Bolce alleges that they did not teach that there are some absolute moral evils, that they did not teach that the Decalogue is sacred, etc., **but that they did teach the contradictory.** Hence Dr. Butler has put down in black and white that the professors are excusable for not teaching that the Decalogue is sacred, because **it is false that it is sacred,** according to Dr. Butler. Dr. Butler thus confesses guilt in his clients.

The reader is asked to observe the dates of Dr. Butler's article, September 25, 1909, December, 1909. Before those dates the September "Cosmopolitan" had already appeared. It is indeed possible that the President

of Columbia had disdained to look at it. For he tells us in September and again in December that Mr. Bolce had written three articles. The number was actually five in September.

In the fifth article, "Rallying Round the Cross," many ecclesiastics are cited as agreeing with Mr. Bolce in his attack on many American universities. Many other clergymen of the same sentiments had been cited by the daily newspapers. But the only one of these ecclesiastics whom Dr. Butler in any way notices is the Catholic Bishop McFaul of Trenton. Why did the President of Columbia single out this **Catholic bishop as the sole butt of abuse,** which, however, all the others must take to themselves?

Again, Archbishop Farley, on October 6, 1909, sent out a pastoral

to be read on the following Sunday at all the Masses in all the churches of the archdiocese of New York. In it he uses the following words: "In this our day the intelligent observer must feel the truth of the words of the Apostle, 'For there shall be a time when they will not endure sound doctrine; but according to their own desires they will heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and will indeed turn away their hearing from the truth, but will be turned to fables' (2 *Tim.* iv. 3, 4). How applicable to the literature of the hour and to the **teaching to-day of many institutions of higher learning!**"

The President of Columbia will see from these words that His Grace of New York on October 6th declared himself a critic such as Dr. Butler,

in December, calls of the **baser sort, ignorant and impertinent, etc., etc.**

There is another coincidence between Dr. Butler's article of September and December and Mr. Bolce's article of September, which is equally awkward for the President of Columbia.

On pages 519-520 Dr. Butler says: "Paradoxical as it may seem, the great enemy of good college teaching is the new highly specialized scholarship. The colleges are plentifully supplied with distinguished men, to whom the education of the young is a lost art or a negligible quantity. . . . College men of an older generation never tire of talking of Anderson of Rochester . . . and a score more, *clara et venerabilia nomina.* Just so the student of to-day seeks strong and noble personalities

among his teachers, is guided by them, and responds quickly to their stimulus, when he can find them. Of such one may be permitted to mention George R. Carpenter of Columbia and Garman of Amherst among the sadly early dead, and Fine of Princeton and **King of Oberlin among the living.** Rich personality and human sympathy and insight plus scholarship is the formula for a good teacher."

We heartily congratulate Dr. Butler on this classic tribute to the good teacher. And we easily believe on his word in the greatness of the teachers whom he praises. Dr. Henry Churchill King is one of the two living great teachers, according to Dr. Butler. But **does Dr. King praise Dr. Butler's side of this controversy?** According to Mr. Bolce he has been

willing to appear as a witness for the other side!

"Henry Churchill King, president of Oberlin College, is a deeply religious character. He refers to Clerk-Maxwell, who wrote that he had looked into most philosophical systems, but had seen none that would work without a God. Dr. King says that there is no sound reason, philosophically or scientifically, for denying that God has actual access to our minds, and that we forget that philosophy, as commonly taught even in avowedly Christian colleges, intentionally ignores all the facts that are involved in historic revelation. It is asserted that, as was said in Bacon's day, philosophy 'has substituted the raven for the dove' as a symbol of the Holy Ghost."[1]

[1]The Cosmopolitan, September, 1909, p. 495.

If this paragraph truly presents the sentiments of Dr. King, he affirms as a fact that philosophy, as commonly taught in our American colleges, ignores Moses and the prophets, Christ and the apostles, and substitutes the raven for the dove as the symbol of the Holy Ghost, and thus studiously misrepresents divine revelation.

Moreover, he implies that many in our day teach that philosophic systems can work without a God, and that many others teach that God has no access to our minds and is the Unknowable. Therefore, Dr. King implicitly affirms many of the chief facts which Dr. Butler has not dared to deny, but has sought to shield, and Dr. Butler's praise of Dr. King and Dr. King's blame of Dr. Butler's case are an awkward coincidence.

Dr. Butler, to be consistent, must now say that Dr. King is ignorant, etc., etc.

Dr. Butler accused Bishop McFaul of "turning from the faith once delivered to the saints." The bishop replied that the faith once delivered to the saints includes a belief in a personal and triune God, in the incarnation and divinity of Christ, in the existence of one divinely authorized and infallible Church, in the immortality of the soul, in the sacramental and indissoluble nature of marriage, and asked why does Dr. Butler not deny that these articles are derided in many American universities? We would have asked this question merely with regard to Columbia and Barnard. **Dr. Butler has not answered because he cannot.**

From these testimonies the reader

may see for himself that in many of our colleges many teachers do openly deny the existence of any true morality; that very many deny that we can *know* that it exists or what it is; that these openly **trample under foot all the fruits** of the moral tree, but that others, while pretending to spare or foster the fruits, lay the **axe to one or all of the roots.**

Thus many teach materialism and deny the existence of any soul, or at least of an intellectual and free spirit capable of a moral act. Numbers proclaim that one may be a good man and have no religion, and they thus openly cut out all the commandments of the first table of the Decalogue. Very many talk pantheism or open atheism, or say that if there is one, true, personal God, He is unknowable. By the fact, they at least ig-

nore the Sovereign Creator, who alone could say, "I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt not, etc." We know that without such a Legislator from whom all power or authority comes, there can not be an idea of true moral obligation, duty, or virtue, or right, any more than there can be an idea of the right time of day without the idea of the sun.

There are many who scoff at the future life, without which the Omnipotent Ruler of our race would be manifestly unjust and His moral laws absurd. Finally, there are very, very many who scoff at the Bible and all divine revelation, and thus undermine all distinctively Christian or Hebrew morality.

Mr. Bolce was, therefore, right in asserting that there are **many professors among us blasting at the rock**

of ages, and we had cause to be startled and exclaim, "What times! What morals! Where on earth are we?"

It is strange that Dr. Butler and others should complain of us as attacking the existing order or established institutions, whilst we are defending morality and Christianity, which are an order and institution long established and of paramount importance.

Our great colleges are doing excellent work in many lines. But some agents of the colleges go out of their way to assert wild philosophical or theological hypotheses as true science, and to misrepresent Christianity, and to proclaim that openness of mind and love of truth and scientific inquiry can not coexist with faith in Christianity.

Pasteur was a scientist and a dis-

coverer, and perhaps the greatest benefactor of humanity of all recent discoverers of scientific truth, and yet he said: "I have studied much, and I have the faith of the Breton peasant. If I had studied more, I would have the faith of the Breton peasant woman."

If such lax talk about the new religion, the new morality, and the new civilization penetrates down from college professors through the press and the primary schools into the mind and life of the mass of the American people, we shall finally have no religion, no morality, and no civilization but the Epicurean paganism described by St. Paul, **which is essentially un-American and can not produce Americans, and there will be no America of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson.**

PRINTED BY BENZIGER RROTHERS, NEW YORK.

3 5282 00110 4861

	DATE DUE		

BJ49
S5

STACKS BJ49.S5
Semple, Henry Churchill,
What times! What morals! Where on earth
3 5282 00110 4861